

**ETS & IARC
BRIEFING BOOK**

Structure

Each topic addressed in the book would consist of three sections:

- I. A "white paper" including citations and bibliography
- II. A one or two page executive summary of the white paper
- III. Message points based on the white paper

All sections will be written in a narrative style which can be understood by a non-technical reader in government, the media or an allied organization.

Table of Contents

- { 1.0 IARC - general information
- 1.1 Agency description and mandate
- 1.2 Prior activity and conclusions on tobacco including active smoking, ETS and policy position on smoking and health

→ 2.0 IARC - multicenter study

- 2.1 Study description, objective, outcome scenarios

? → 2.2 Review of scientific literature on ETS on populations in the eight *Evan* collaborating countries

2.3 Review of the literature on tobacco authored by each of the country collaborators and Agency staff involved with the study. Can we predict bias?

→ 2.4 Analysis of lung cancer incidence in the eleven *centers* and identification of independant risk factors

2.5 Analysis of the study questionnaire to identify weaknesses and compare with other agency surveys, etc.

2.6 Agency internal guidelines for conducting epidemiology

2.7 Listing of other Agency epidemiology surveys and outcomes for comparison purposes, i.e., how will the ETS study measure up, what precedents for similar multicenter epidemiology studies exist, identification of criteria to compare the ETS study with other IARC studies to identify inconsistencies and use of "double standard"

*Andie
for WHD*

direct

202.1767736

3.0 ETS, general information

3.1 What is ETS?

3.2 Status of the scientific literature identifying key studies, conclusions, flaws, etc.

3.3 Separate reviews of the studies specifically on:

- workplace
- restaurant
- home

3.4 Argumentation for key target audiences to support accommodation

- employers
- unions
- government
- hospitality

3.5 Analysis of the EPA report including findings, weaknesses, the "science or politics" message

- differences between IARC and EPA approaches to risk assessments to serve as basis for comparing the two studies, e.g., EPA is meta-analysis based on existing studies v. IARC is original research

MR

NRC

MATT

4.0 What is epidemiology?
• Is there a legitimate role for epidemiology? - Peter Lee
• What are the limits to low risk epidemiology? - Digby Anderson

4.1 Role of epidemiology for formulating risk assessments/evaluations and as the basis for regulation

4.2 Criteria for good epidemiology, including citations from U.S. FDA, ISO, CEN, EPA, EU, IARC, peer review papers, textbooks, etc.
• The weak links in epidemiological data must be identified and defined including confounders, misclassification bias, recall, lack of exposure data, etc.

4.3 Examples of the misuse of epidemiology including
• "low-level" risk to compare with ETS estimates
• reversals (U.S. and international) in regulations following reevaluation of the science, e.g., dioxin, BST, ozone, global warming, diesel exhaust, etc.

4.4 Risk assessments v. risk evaluation
• differences and implications
• differences between European and U.S. attitudes towards risk evaluations and risk assessments, respectively

2024762737